

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/919,538

07/31/2001

James Joseph Babka

021556.0124

4376

31625

7590

06/15/2004

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500
AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/919,538	BABKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VAN H NGUYEN	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/7/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - (i) "a request meant" (claim 2, line 5) should read "a request means"
 - (ii) the abbreviation "NMS" used in the claim 13 should be defined.Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - A. The following phrases lack antecedent basis:
 - (i) the devices (claim 1, line 4 and claim 11, line 5)
 - (ii) the override object (claim 2, line 4)

Art Unit: 2126

B. The phrase "a device" (claim 1, line 10) is indefinite because it is not clear if Applicant intends to refer it to "a device" claimed in line 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

6. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 14-15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Grooters** (U.S. 6,389,487).

7. As to claim 1, Grooters teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a video network platform for managing video network devices (col.1, lines 15-20, lines 60-67, and fig.1), the video network platform comprising:

- a network interface module operable to interface with the devices and to represent a device as an interface object (fig.1 and associated text);
- one or more management applications operable to manage a device represented as an application object (col.2, lines 4-10 and col.5, lines 24-30); and
- an adapter engine associated with the network interface module (col. 3, lines 34-59 and figs. 3-4).

Grooters does teach the adapter engine, but does not specifically teach the adapter engine operable to create an application object for a device, the application object corresponding to the interface object for the device.

Grooters, however, discloses “an adapter operatively coupled to the video device for providing access to the video device to one or more applications executable by the information handling system” (col.1, lines 53-59).

In view of Grooters’ teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included “the adapter engine operable to create an application object for a device, the application object corresponding to the interface object for the device” because this will allow multiple applications to simultaneously share and control a single video device.

8. As to claim 2, Grooters teaches an override interface object associated with the network interface, the override object operable to accept a request means for an interface object and to direct the request to an application object corresponding to the interface object (fig.6 and associated text).

9. As to claim 3, Grooters teaches a discovery engine associated with the network interface, the discovery engine operable to detect devices and initiate creation of an object to represent a detected device (col.6, lines 8-18).

10. As to claim 4, Grooters teaches the discovery engine initiates creation of an application object by the adapter engine, the adapter engine further operable to initiate creation of a corresponding interface object by the network interface (col.1 lines 51-59).

11. As to claim 5, Grooters teaches the adapter engine incorporates attributes of the interface

Art Unit: 2126

object into the corresponding application object (fig.4 and associated text).

12. As to claim 6, Grooters teaches the interface object comprises a managed object (col.5 lines 32-51).

13. As to claim 8, Grooters teaches a scheduling application (fig.7 and associated text).

14. As to claim 10, Grooters teaches a monitoring application (col.5, lines 32-50).

15. As to claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Grooters further teaches detecting a video device interfaced with the network (col.6, lines 8-33); forwarding the interface information to the application object (fig.7 and associated text); and populating the application object with device information (col.1, lines 50-59 and col.7, lines 13-30).

16. As to claim 14, Grooters teaches interfacing a management application with a device through the application object corresponding with the device (col.6, lines 8-33).

17. As to claims 15 and 17, note the rejections of claims 8 and 10 above.

18. As to claim 18, Grooters teaches applying dynamic attribute query capabilities to populate a corresponding interface object (col.7, lines 13-30).

19. As to claim 19, note the discussion of claim 1 above for "creating an interface object that corresponds to the application object."

20. Claims 7, 9, 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Grooters** in view of **Golden et al.** (U.S. 6,272,127).

21. As to claim 7, Grooters does not explicitly teach a Management Bean.

Golden teaches a Management Bean (col.7, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Golden and Grooters because Golden's teaching would have provided the capability for adding a number of Java features, such as reuseable, platform-independent components to Grooters's system, and making Grooters's system well suited for the World Wide Web environment.

22. As to claim 9, Grooters does not explicitly teach a diagnostics application.

Golden teaches a diagnostics application (col.16, lines 5-16).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Golden and Grooters because Golden's teaching would have provided the capability for diagnosing problems of the video devices. Therefore, facilitating the controlling of the video devices in the system.

23. As to claim 12, note the discussion of claim 7 above for rejection.

24. As to claim 13, Grooters does not explicitly teach a Web NMS Managed Object.

Golden teaches a Web NMS Managed Object (col.40, lines 3-13).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Golden and Grooters because Golden's teaching would have provided the capability for managing the video devices in the Web environment.

25. As to claim 16, note the discussion of claim 9 above for rejection.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Stephens, Jr. (U.S. 6633324) teaches "System and method for video call configuration and scheduling."

- Horlander et al. (U.S. 6507953) teaches "System and method for interfacing multiple electronic devices."

- Hamilton (U.S. 6353862) teaches "Video device manager for managing motion video output devices and supporting contexts and buffer adoption."

- Eisler et al. (U.S. 6078942) teaches "Resource management for multimedia devices in a computer."

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2126

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VHN



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100